AFS-600
Regulatory Support Division

Vol. 16, No. 2 APRIL **2004**

A quarterly publication designed to serve the Examiner, Designee, and Instructor Community.

IN THIS UPDATE

CORRECTION

Paul,

I made an error in the article in the January Designee Update and it must be corrected. In the article, I stated that a DPE could issue a Wings certificate after a check ride if that DPE were an Aviation Safety Counselor. This should not be done.

I have since spoken to Ken Spivey, Southern Region SPM, and he informed me that a student pilot can use the 3 hours of flight instruction in preparation for the check ride as the required flight time for the Wings certificate. But, the applicant has to attend an FAA sanctioned safety seminar either before or after the check ride. The main requirement is that the safety seminar and the 3 hours flight instruction must be accomplished within a 12-month period. I still believe that DPEs should give the Safety Program a helping hand and encourage pilots to participate in the Wings Program and keep reference safety material on hand to pass on to the applicant after conducting a check ride.

Sorry if the January article caused any confusion.
Ken Pannell
Memphis FSDO

IACRA AT LAST

By Dave Fosdick Special Assistant for AFS-800 and Tim Matzell

The Integrated Airman Certification and/or Rating Application (IACRA) software is now authorized for use on the Internet as a major enhancement to the airman certification process.

Most of us used the traditional, “manual” method of obtaining a pilot’s certificate. You brought a hard copy of the Airman Certificate and/or Rating Application (FAA Form 8710-1) with you to the practical test. After you passed the test, the examiner issued you a temporary certificate and mailed the application to the Civil Aviation Registry in Oklahoma City. However, if an error was found, the entire file was mailed back to the Flight Standards District Office. Once the correction was made, it was returned to the Civil Aviation Registry for re-examination. The process could take up to 120 days before you received your certificate in the mail.

In the early 1990’s, the FAA developed the Airman Certification and/or Rating Application (ACRA) process and provided a CD to Flight Standards District Offices (FSDO) and Designated Pilot Examiners (DPE). It is a computer program that processes applications for airmen certification and ratings, checks to ensure that regulatory and policy requirements are met, and produces certification documents, such as a temporary certificate. The examiner enters the information into the ACRA program after you arrive for the practical test. The ACRA program validates the flight hours against the Federal Aviation Regulations and determines if your medical and knowledge test results are current.

Many Aviation Safety Inspectors, Aviation Safety Technicians, and Designated Examiners have used the stand-alone ACRA CD for many years. ACRA is an improvement over the traditional method, but the hard copy application and attachments must still be mailed to Oklahoma City

WHY WAS IACRA DEVELOPED?

IACRA is different from ACRA in that it’s web based. You don’t have to install or download any software to get the same functionality as you did with ACRA. In fact, IACRA has the following advantages:

- You can access it anywhere you have an Internet connection.
- A single tracking number is permanently assigned to each airman.
- Your time to complete an application is reduced by using online data entry.
- Your input data is auto-checked to reduce potential errors and the number of rejected applications.
- Digital signatures ensure that data is captured, wrapped, archived, and the signature is validated as required.
- The overall certification process time is significantly reduced.
- The uniform interpretation of airman certification regulations automatically ensures that the applicant meets regulatory and policy requirements.

The new IACRA web-based version uses digital signature, which allows electronic transfer of the airman application to the Registry. An applicant, recommending instructor, and examiner can complete the application on the IACRA web site. The recommending instructor may digitally sign the recommendation before the day of the practical test. The applicant and the examiner digitally sign the application, and after the practical test forward it electronically to Oklahoma City.

IACRA uses "roles" to determine the level of access a person has to the system. For example, an individual can select “Applicant,” “Recommending Instructor,” or “Certifying Officer.” A certifying officer is an Aviation Safety Inspector, an Aviation Safety Technician, or a Designated Examiner. Except for new applicants, IACRA validates individuals by their FAA certificates. Each time a person chooses a role and registers, the information is verified against various FAA databases to determine currency.

IACRA is one of the first programs to satisfy the Government Paperwork Elimination Act. It is an option that saves time and assures compliance with airman certification regulations.

Dave Fosdick is a Special Assistant in the General Aviation and Commercial Division, Washington, DC and Tim Matzell is a Technical Writer for Titan Corporation, Oklahoma City, OK

IACRA ROLLOUT SCHEDULE

We will roll out IACRA region by region based on the following schedule:

Southern	Now Available
Southwest	Now Available
Great Lakes	February 2004
Western Pacific	April 2004
Eastern	June 2004
Northwest Mountain / Central	August 2004
New England / Alaska	September 2004

WHAT’S NEXT?

The current version of IACRA includes student pilot through Airline Transport Pilot certifications. We will add the following enhancements during the next year:

- Part 141 school certifications
- CFI renewal process
- Letter of Authorizations
- Light Sport Pilot Aircraft Repairman
- Light Sport Pilot Aircraft Maintenance
- Part 142 training center certifications

This is part of the IACRA Team that made the process possible. Elizabeth Cody, Ray Lewallen, Larry Hilderbrand, Carol Thornton, Nancy Owens, and Josh Myers

INSTRUMENT PTS REVISION

The Instrument Rating Practical Test Standards for Airplane, Helicopter, and Powered Lift, FAA-S-8081-4D, has been revised. It is currently in printing and will enter distribution later this spring or in early summer. The latest version will be available online by following the link at http://afs600.faa.gov when distribution begins.

As part of the ongoing effort to keep PTSs current with other FAA documents, the reference section has been updated to the latest versions. The material in the PTS matches what each document says as of the date of publication. Practical test prerequisite requirements have been updated to current rules.

Some changes have been added to make the PTS more user friendly. An abbreviation section has been added. The "Plan of Action" is more thoroughly explained to include the reference the use of scenarios. The requirement for the use of a view-limiting device has been clarified. Reference to the metric system has been eliminated.

Other significant changes have been made in the PTS procedures. Testing in modern aircraft with electronic flight instrument displays has been addressed. The use of GPS for navigation and approaches has been clarified, and the requirement for a GPS approach has been added. The use of autopilot and flight management systems during testing has been covered. The body of the PTS has also been updated to include electronic flight instrument displays, flight management systems, GPS, and autopilot usage.

Approach terminology has been updated to include Precision Approach (PA), Approach with Vertical Guidance (APV), and Nonprecision Approach (NPA). The requirements for their use have been clarified.

Needs for testing in certain areas were identified based on field comments and experience. As a result, testing in Single-Pilot Resource Management has been addressed and clarified. Further, testing basic instrument flight maneuvers throughout the practical test instead of being treated as separate TASKs is addressed in AREA OF OPERATION IV.

The PTS remains a tool for use by inspectors, examiners, instructors, and applicants. Comments regarding any PTS should be sent in e-mail form to AFS630comments@faa.gov.

HANDBOOK REVISIONS

Handbook revision and development continues to proceed at a steady pace. The handbooks use the designation system, FAA-H-8083-XX, with the last 2 digits changing for each handbook. A significant effort has been made to improve the graphics, cover the latest technology advances, and provide information to help pilots operate safely.

The latest handbook to "hit the street" is the 2003 version of the Pilot's Handbook of Aeronautical Knowledge, FAA-H-8083-25. It replaces Advisory Circular (AC) 61-23C. Paper copy distribution started in February 2004. It is also available online by following the links at http://afs600.faa.gov.

A broad spectrum of knowledge is covered for pilots of all aircraft categories and classes. It should be used in conjunction with other handbooks, which are category specific. The chapters have been significantly revised and should be reviewed to facilitate locating reference material. Instead of 9 chapters, there are now 16 chapters. There is a separate chapter on Weather Theory and another chapter on Weather Reports, Forecasts and Charts. There are also separate chapters on Weight and Balance apart from Aircraft Performance. New chapter titles include Aircraft Structure, Aerodynamics of Flight, Flight Controls, Aircraft Systems, Flight Manuals and Other Documents, and Aeronautical Decision Making. There is a new section on High Speed Flight within the Aerodynamics of Flight chapter.

The latest revision to the Airplane Flying Handbook, FAA-H-8083-3, is in printing. It should enter distribution later this spring or early summer. It will reflect the effort to provide separate handbooks for different aircraft categories and classes by removing the chapters on seaplanes and skiplanes. Those aircraft classes will be covered in a separate handbook, which will follow later this summer.

The Airplane Flying Handbook will also contain other significant revisions. New chapters will include Performance Maneuvers, Transition to Complex Airplanes, Transition to Turbopropeller Powered Airplanes, and Transition to Jet Powered Airplanes. The Airplane Flying Handbook will be available online at http://afs600.faa.gov.

Comments regarding any PTS should be sent in e-mail form to AFS630comments@faa.gov.

LIGHT SPORT AVIATION BRANCH

The Light Sport Aviation Branch (AFS-610) will come to life on April 18, 2004. The branch will consist of a manager, three airworthiness and two operations inspectors. An additional program management analysis will be added at a later date to assist in the administrative and support needs for the branch.

The branch will plan, develop and conduct initial and recurrent seminars for the Sport Pilot Designated Pilot Examiner (SPDPE) program and the Designated Airworthiness Representatives – Light-Sport Aircraft (DAR-LSA) program. This branch will also provide technical support to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) field offices and aviation industry concerning light-sport pilot polices and procedures.

Additional responsibilities will include the acceptance and tracking of manufacturer and industry training programs for repairmen. The branch will have policy responsibility for the Light Sport Standardization Board (LSSB) and is the repository for all applications for the SPDPE and DAR-LSA programs. The branch will also the appointing authority for the SPDPE program and recommending authority for the DAR-LSA program.

The branch web site is located at http://*afs600.faa.gov*. More information will be available at this web site after the regulation is signed and available to the public.

EARLY MISSED APPROACH

On December 1, 1974, a TWA 727 crashed while on approach to Dulles, killing all 92 people aboard. The NTSB was far from unanimous in its analysis of the accident. However, all members did agree that a contributing factor to the crash was "the failure of the FAA to take timely action to resolve the confusion and misinterpretation of air traffic terminology although the Agency had been aware of the problem for several years".

Many pilots had been taught that, while under radar contact, the phrase "cleared for the approach" included a clearance to descend to the initial approach fix altitude. The air traffic controllers used it to mean what we know today, which is the pilot must maintain the last assigned altitude until established on a segment of the approach. As a result of the 1974 accident, three things happened to correct this misunderstanding: the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) was changed, 14 CFR 91.175(i) was written, and the Aviation Safety Reporting System (ASRS) was born.

Today, almost 30 years later, many pilots hold a similar dangerous misconception regarding instrument flight procedures. As was the case 30 years ago, little if any documentation exists to correct this fallacy.

Paragraph 5-4-19 of the AIM states "when an early missed approach is executed, pilots should, unless otherwise cleared by ATC, fly the IAP as specified on the approach plate to the missed approach point at or above the MDA or DH before executing a turning maneuver." The AIM also says that once at the missed approach point (MAP) altitude must be gained at rate of 200' per mile. However, no documentation addresses altitude during the early missed approach procedure before reaching the MAP. As a result, many pilots hold a mistaken belief; if they abandon the approach they many not climb until they reach the MAP. This is dangerous because an early missed approach is usually executed when things are not going well. Failing to climb increases the odds that things are going to get worse.

No official document supports the notion that a pilot must not climb prior to reaching the MAP. Everyone involved in the design, management, or monitoring of the air traffic control system agrees that a climb before the MAP is the right decision. Unfortunately, that information has never made its way into print and the misconception continues.

To make the subject a little more complicated, a few approaches in the system have an overlying maximum authorized altitude (MAA) that require a pilot to descend to cross under the MAA. An example is the ILS RWY 7 approach into Orlando International. Despite strong urging from the National Business Aircraft Association (NBAA) to eliminate these few approaches, they remain in the system.

Perhaps the FAA will add documentation to the AIM specifying climb procedures during an early missed approach, but until that time, we need to use every resource possible to eliminate this dangerous misconception. Therefore, when you administer a practical test that involves instrument procedures, include a question on how to execute an early missed approach. Listen to ensure that both altitude and turn considerations are included in the answer. You may be the link in the safety chain that prevents another crash born of procedural confusion.

Bob Linenweber, DPE

TEACHING DECISION-MAKING

Flight instructors are very good at preparing applicants for the various maneuvers and procedures required for pilot certification. Students are drilled until they are able to maintain altitude precisely in a steep turn, execute a lazy-eight with precision and finesse, and perform landings accurately under a variety of conditions. However, students are sometimes less well prepared to accept the responsibilities associated with being "pilot in command." A frequent comment heard from pilot examiners is that applicants for certification are too willing to surrender their authority to others, such as the examiner or air traffic controller. In other words, we must not only train people to be "pilots," we must train them to be "pilots-in-command."

Many pilots are far too quick to relinquish their authority (and responsibilities) for decision-making. These tendencies arise in large part because of the unique nature of the student-instructor relationship. Obviously, at the outset of flight training a student must accept on faith the instructor's judgment and decisions regarding the safe conduct of each flight. However, instructors must develop and encourage decision-making skills as a vital part of training competent pilots.

Every flight involves many decisions. Some have only minor significance: "Should I wear my new altimeter watch today?" Some, on the other hand, are much more critical: "That looks like a small thunderstorm, should I divert around it?" Like every other aspect of learning to fly, decision-making is a skill, which must be practiced. Furthermore, decision-making is a process, which can be expressed as a definite sequence of steps. The following seven steps can be applied to any situation (normal or emergency) where a decision is required.

1. Recognize need.
2. Identify and define situation/problem.
3. Collect facts using all available resources.
4. Identify and weigh impact of alternatives.
5. Select a response.
6. Implement a response.
7. Evaluate the result.

Obviously, some situations allow more time than others to accomplish this process. It is important, therefore, that pilots are well trained in the decision-making process. Here are a few strategies we can use to incorporate this process in our flight training.

- Teach *Situational Awarenes*s (SA). One of the most important skills for pilots to posses, Situational Awareness means continually knowing how you and your aircraft fit into the "big picture." Specifically, it means knowing your position in relation to navaids, airports, terrain, and other traffic; and it means being aware of the airplane's attitude and performance at any given time. Equally important to maintaining SA is being able to anticipate your relationship to all of the above. SA is dynamic and based on a continual reassessment of data from all available sources.
- Even though it's frequently easier (and quicker), don't automatically make decisions for your student. From the beginning of flight training, give your students "permission" to exercise command authority. In fact, demand that they do so. When a controller asks, "Cessna 345, can you make a short approach?" Respond to the student's inevitable look of inquiry by forcing him or her to decide.

- As long as safety isn't compromised, let your student make and follow through with a "wrong" decision.
- Give students positive feedback for making decisions.
- After each flight, conduct a review and evaluation of the decisions made during the course of the flight. This is an excellent tool not only for students, but for all pilots throughout their careers.
- Finally, the most powerful teaching tool is your own example. Your students will learn much about how to make decisions by watching you.

Thomas Krashen,
Michigan Bureau of Aeronautics
2700 E. Airport Service Dr.
Lansing, MI 48906-2160
517-335-9977
517-321-6422 fax

A BIRD IN THE HAND

Alan Edwin Malone
DPE #SW-BTR-22
512 Codifer Blvd.
Metairie, Louisiana 70005-3747
alanm1@cox.net

Let's try a multiple-choice test to see what your reaction is to a hypothetical emergency situation. You have one engine out in a twin-engine airplane and some electrical problems have drained most of the charge out of your battery. You are located 1500 feet above an airport with an 8500 foot paved runway. You should

A) descend and land immediately on the 8500 foot runway.
B) fly 40 miles to another airport before landing.

This is a story about a couple of pilots who were not sitting comfortably on the ground analyzing a hypothetical problem. They were flying an actual airplane in actual marginal weather. When this actually happened to them, they went for option "B," and nearly flunked the test. As an instructor, I was acting as pilot-in-command of this particular flight. A friend of mine worked for a company, which operated a pressurized Cessna 337, and one of his duties was to be the company pilot. Like any responsible pilot working for a sensible company, he took recurrent training, and this time it had fallen my lot to be the instructor. I had done some flying in an unpressurized 337 and thought I knew the airplane pretty well. The difference was that this one had turbocharged engines and a pressurized cabin. My buddy made part of his living flying the thing, so I figured that, between the two of us, we were bringing a fair amount of expertise to the job.

We departed VFR from Lakefront Airport in New Orleans, climbing to get clear of some clouds, which were clogging up the lower altitudes. Around 5500 feet we were reasonably clear of the stuff, and we spent a busy hour going through engine-out drills, finally securing the front engine and feathering the propeller. My student had done well in knocking the rust off his emergency procedures, and I was ready to put him through some work in the traffic pattern.

I looked down and was pleased to see that we had drifted directly over a large hole in the clouds, and that at the bottom of the hole was Stennis International Airport, its unmistakably huge runway beckoning up at us from a mile below. "It's time for an emergency descent," I said. "You wind us into a tight spiral through yon hole and while you¹re doing that, I¹ll get this engine started."

He began his descent and I moved the levers, flipped the switches, and rotated the valves to get the front engine ready to go. Everything went fine until I moved the mag switch into the "start" position. Have you ever seen an airplane sag? That's what this one did. The readings on all of the electrical needles went down. The electric tachometer for the rear engine eased on down toward zero. All of those little panel lights you don¹t usually notice grew dim. The feathered front propeller stood rigid and unmoving like a guard at Buckingham Palace. I let go of the ignition switch and the rear tach needle slowly flopped back up to where it belonged. "It doesn¹t seem to want to crank," I told my client. "Oh heck, the rear alternator¹s out. In all the excitement, I forgot to tell you."

I peeked around the control column. Hiding behind it was an amber idiot light, glowing its message that the battery was not getting a charge. I had not seen it, and my man had been too busy to pay it any heed. With the gear up, gear down, flaps up, flaps down, cowl flaps open, cowl flaps closed (They are electrically actuated in this model.) drills we had been doing, the energy in our battery had been depleted to practically nothing. By the time we figured out what had happened, we were just coming out from the bottom of the hole, about 1500 feet above the ground, right above the exact center of Stennis International Airport. "Let's land and get a jump start," said my student. "Hold on a sec," I replied. "Do you have jumper cables aboard this machine?" "Nope." "Look, man, we're doing just fine, holding our altitude on the back engine. We have the cowl flaps wide open and this bird does better on the back one than on the front. If they don¹t have the right kind of equipment down there to jump us, we're stuck in Bay St. Louis, Mississippi. Let's take what we've got and go home."

See, friends? If you use a certain kind of twisted logic, option "B" doesn't look quite so crazy, does it? Both of us had plenty of time in twins. In my role as an instructor, probably 50% of my twin time has been spent tooling around on one engine. The rear engine was running cool and we were making about 120 knots without even breathing hard. What the hey, let's head for the barn! My student took up a heading along the interstate highway. He figured he'd have a good place to park it in case the rear one quit. I sat back and relaxed. Most of my 20 or so years of flying had been in single-engine airplanes having less performance than this bird had on one. It felt like a strictly no sweat operation.

About halfway home, it became obvious that we had developed serious electrical problems. The rear tach kept sagging, and even the LEDs on the one radio we were running were starting to get dim. Nothing usable was coming in over the nav or the comm. It was obvious that the small amount of reserve juice we had had in the battery was fast leaving us.

I looked at the gear handle. It looked like an electrical switch. I started searching my memory for what I knew about getting the rollers out in 337s. I turned to my client in the left seat. "How's the gear work?" I asked. It's hydraulic, run by an electrical pump," he said. "We have a hand pump that'll get 'em down if there¹s not enough juice left in the battery." "Yeah, but what I want to know is, does it take electricity to initiate the emergency extension cycle? That gear handle looks to me like an electrical switch, not a hydraulic valve." "Gee, you've got me," replied my fellow professional. Both of us highly qualified push-pull Cessna pilots thought we knew how the system worked, but neither of us did. We knew that the aft end of the fuselage came about 80% disassembled to let the gear extend, but we didn't know whether it took any electricity to operate any part of the system.
"I¹m thinking we might ought to try getting the gear down while we still have anything in that battery," I said. "It's sure not going to get any better, that's for sure." "Lemme do it," he said. "I've never tried an actual emergency gear extension in this thing."

We ran the checklist and pulled the hand pump out. He started pumping and the gear doors started opening with a gratifying whoosh. He was really getting into this. He pumped with vigor as the wheels came out and then down. He pumped until he couldn't pump any more, and we saw three very dim green lights indicating that the wheels were down and locked.

Unfortunately, the gear doors, that 80% of the rear of the fuselage I was telling you about, remained disassembled. Evidently, electrons were required to close the gear doors, and we didn't have enough energy left in the battery to pull them in against the slipstream.

At this moment, we were about ten miles from home plate, descending a little less than 200 feet per minute because of the extra drag of the open gear doors. I started looking at Interstate 10, the swamp, and Lake Ponchartrain, our three choices for forced landing sites. We hadn¹t really tried boosting the back engine yet, and I suspect that we could have maintained altitude if we had wanted to push it; but the engine was running smoothly and coolly, and we were hesitant at this time to try anything else that might further degrade our situation. Everything that had changed so far had been for the worse.

We were descending through 800 feet when we hit the downwind leg for runway 13, rocking our wings in response to the green light from the tower. A normal landing was followed by the forlorn sight of the Cessna taxiing in with the front prop feathered and all of the gear doors hanging open. We learn from experience. This fiasco brought us about ten minutes of tension that seemed like an hour, but we lucked out and walked away from it without bending the Reynolds Wrap. Two lessons were impressed on me by the experience. Know your airplane's systems, not just the superficial phrases you find in the owner¹s manual. Really learn how the damn things work!

If you have some mechanical problem with an airplane and there is an easy landing to be had, take it! Often it is a snowballing combination of little problems, which brings airplanes out of the sky prematurely, instead of one gigantic mishap. In this case, we had a combined malfunction of the machine and of the pilot who was supposed to be in charge of it. We could well have ended up in the swamp with the alligators fighting the mosquitoes over our tender bodies, or going head-to-head with some eighteen wheeler on the interstate because of our cavalier reaction to, and ignorance about, the seemingly minor malfunction we had suffered. Next time It¹ll be "option A" for me. You better believe it!

AERODYNAMICALLY DIRTY AIRCRAFT AIN'T ALL BAD

To be a good glider tug an airplane needs to have its best rate of climb speed, Vy, close to the glider's recommended tow speed. Not much more that 60 MPH. Plenty of horsepower and light wing loading are also needed. Most small planes are designed for cruise speed where a clean drag free form is necessary. These planes are usually unresponsive and uncomfortable to fly at Glider towing speeds. On the other hand Agriculture Application planes (Dusters) are designed to fly slow with heavy loads. High-speed drag is not a problem. Take the weight out of the hopper and put it on the end of a tow line and you have a high performing glider tug that is easy to fly all day. And being kinda dirty it comes down well too, which is the other half of Glider towing.
Then we have the Wilga. It was designed for everything so it does nothing well. It has a rather narrow wing with flaps and fixed leading edge slats so it looks like a STOL airplane. It has huge cushioned landing gear so it looks like a bush plane. It has a big radial engine so it looks like it has lots of torque. The torque is un-American which means a tired left leg for the tow pilot. A high

performance glider like the Lark on high tow can pull it's tail up and stop the climb. It has a pilot error inducing fuel system and to top it all off it has a power off glide ratio like a helicopter on autorotation. This comes from it being aerodynamically dirty (Read ugly) and those big flat canoe paddles wind milling up front.

How all this gets you in trouble on the approach is - if you pull off to much power your descent gets very steep. If you react by pulling the stick back you just lose airspeed and now you don't have enough energy to stop your descent with a flair. That narrow wing doesn't gain much from ground affect. So you do a three point plop, then you rock and roll as the landing gear collapses unevenly. BUT – having the ability to make a steep approach can be a lifesaver as was demonstrated at Hood River recently.

The Schweizer 2-33 is more or less a standard American glider trainer. It gets a lot of bad mouth from glider pilots who have moved on to glass sail planes. With a glide ratio barely twice as good as a Cessna and half as good as a modern high performance glider the old 2-33 is still the best ship in a tight spot. One of the things you have to learn to do is make a landing without the use of spoilers, flaps or drag breaks. Hard to do with an aerodynamically clean sailplane. Not so the 2-33, turn it sideways and it slows down dramatically. Then when the high performance ship gets on the ground it rolls along trying to stop with one tiny four inch brake on one wheel. Not so the 2-33, it has a nose skid with which you can plow up a furrow. The 2-33 can get down and get stopped which was recently demonstrated at Hood River.

Hood River is a 3000 foot paved airport completely surrounded by inhospitable orchards, rocks and other hard places. The runway is uphill to the west, down to the east about 1% with a 1000 foot parallel grass strip on the east end. We are finally getting to the point with this story of a recent adventure at Hood River.

This was an ordinary day with about a ten-knot west wind. The Wilga and the 2-33 took off to the West on the second flight of the day using a 200-foot towline. At about mid field and something above 200 feet altitude the tow plane lost power and started down. Witnesses said that both ends of the rope were released at the same time. I doubt that there was any conversation in the tow plane. He was trying to make it to the rest of the runway. He landed in the soft grass overrun and got stopped well short of the road at the end. The landing gear and the soft ground yielded enough to catch a prop tip. Had this been a Pawnee or any of our other tow planes they would have gone across the road and been badly damaged. Drag and being too ugly to die saved the day here. In the glider the conversation went something like this.

P. The tow plane is going down.
D. Looks like he's lost power. What are you going to do?
P. Release.
D. Good idea. Now what?
P. Turn back to the field.
D. It's right under you and downhill and downwind.
P. I can make it. The tow plane is going to the West end.
D. OK but put it on the grass; I don't trust the brakes on these birds.
P. OK.

The spoilers came on full. The 2-33 turned sideways and came down out of the sky. It touched down at pretty high speed on the near end of the grass. Wheel locked and nose in the dirt. With the tail wind and down hill we dug a furrow to within 100 feet of the east end. I doubt that anything but a 2-33 could have made that landing. A high performance ship could have done a 360 and landed behind the tow plane, hopefully missing it. In the 2-33 we had a choice.

An interesting touch to this adventure is that “P.” above is a student pilot taking a check ride with an examiner “D”. “P” had failed a check ride a month before by not properly performing the task “Slips To a Landing”. This flight he completed the tasks “Abnormal Occurrences”, “Normal landing to a designated Point”, “Downwind Landing” and of course the “Slip”. He wasn’t lying when he said he knew he could make it. He had been practicing for a month.

The next time you feel like bad mouthing a dirty old Schweizer remember that some day you’ll see one out climb you with a skilled pilot on board and when it comes to landing out any day you’ll wish you were in one.

Dave Wiley, DPE

NEW EXAMINER RENEWAL PROCEDURE

The following new examiner renewal procedures are authorized by AFS-840 until the changes to Order 8700.1 and 8710.3D are published.

3. PROCEDURES.

A. Renew [or Reinstate] a Current Designation. An examiner must accomplish renewal annually.

(1) Apply for renewal not less than 60 days before the expiration of the examiner's current designation.
(2) Submit a letter from the examiner requesting renewal [or reinstatement] and the designation(s) the examiner is requesting to be renewed (see Figure 3-1).
(3) Submit a completed Airman Certificate and/or Rating Application, FAA Form 8710-1 and mark the box “Other” and write in *Renewal [or Reinstatement] of DPE Authorization*.
(4) Submit a copy of the examiner’s current pilot, flight instructor, and medical certificate.
(5) Submit a record of the examiner’s practical testing activity for the preceding 12 calendar months.
(6) Accomplish a recurrent or an Initial Pilot Examiner Standardization Seminar within the preceding 24 calendar months.
(7) Attendance at the annual examiner meeting held by the FSDO within the preceding 12 calendar months, if appropriate.
(8) Provide the supervising FSDO a list of the examiner’s testing activities for the previous 12 months.
(9) Schedule and complete a practical test in accordance with the procedures that are outlined in Chapter 2, section 2, paragraphs 3 through 5, as applicable.

B. Reinstate an Expired Examiner Designation. Contact the supervising FSDO to determine whether there is a need for designation.

(1) If the FSDO confirms that need for the former examiner's services justifies reinstatement, that former examiner must complete Airman Certificate and/or Rating Application, FAA Form 8710-1. The completed application should be submitted to the supervising FSDO.
(2) Proceed with the reinstatement process by:

(a) Submit a letter from the examiner requesting reinstatement and the designation(s) the examiner is requesting to be renewed (see Figure 3-1).
(b) Submit a completed Airman Certificate and/or Rating Application, FAA Form 8710-1 and mark the box "Other" and write in *Reinstatement of DPE Authorization*.
(c) Submit a copy of the examiner's current pilot, flight instructor, and medical certificate.
(d) Submit a record of the examiner's practical testing activity for the time period since the last renewal of his/her DPE authorization.
(e) Accomplish a recurrent or an Initial Pilot Examiner Standardization Seminar within the preceding 24 calendar months.
(f) Attendance at the annual examiner meeting held by the FSDO within the preceding 12 calendar months, if appropriate.
(g) Provide the supervising FSDO a list of the examiner's testing activities for the time period since the last renewal of his/her DPE authorization.
(h) Schedule and complete a practical test in accordance with the procedures that are outlined in Chapter 2, section 2, paragraphs 3 through 5, as applicable.

FIGURE 3-1—SAMPLE RENEWAL [OR REINSTATEMENT] LETTER

[DATE]

FAA, SW FSDO No. 15
The Parkway Building -- Suite 601
1300 S. Meridian
Oklahoma City, OK 73108

To Whom It May Concern:

I am requesting to renew [or reinstate] my Designated Pilot Examiner authorization (SW-15-05) for the following authorization:

Private Pilot Certification
Airplane Single Engine Land
Airplane Multiengine Land [Cessna 310 and Cessna 402]

Commercial Pilot Certification
Airplane Single Engine Land
Airplane Multiengine Land [Cessna 310 and Cessna 402]

Instrument Rating-Airplane
Airplane Single Engine Land
Airplane Multiengine Land [Cessna 310 and Cessna 402]

Flight Instructor-Airplane
Airplane Single Engine
Airplane Multiengine

Sincerely,

Paul J. Maenza
1 Switzer Blvd
Oklahoma City, OK 73125
(405) 555-1212

Enclosures:
1. A copy of my current pilot certificate
2. A copy of my flight instructor certificate
3. A copy of my medical certificate
4. A copy of my record of practical testing activity for the preceding 12 calendar months
5. FAA Form 8710-1 Application